

Application Number 10/589548  
Response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2008

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 16 2008

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of original claims 2 and 3 in addition to editorial revisions; accordingly, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 have been amended editorially.

Claims 3-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 3 has been canceled and its content has been included in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respond to the rejection of claim 3 as a rejection of claim 1. In addition to the inclusion of the content of claims 2 and 3, claim 1 has been amended editorially to clarify the relationship between the total content of all oxides, which must be higher than 90 mol %, and the content of  $\text{SiO}_2$ , which must be at least 74 mol %, i.e., if no other oxide than  $\text{SiO}_2$  is selected, the content of  $\text{SiO}_2$  must be higher than 90 mol %. Therefore, claim 1 is definite.

Claim 4 has been amended editorially to state clearly, that the content of  $\text{SiO}_2$  be at least 70 mol % higher than that of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ .

Claim 6 has been amended editorially to state clearly that the total content of the selected members from  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  and  $\text{B}_2\text{O}_3$  is between 5 and 20 mol % when  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  and/or  $\text{B}_2\text{O}_3$  is selected according to claim 5. Thus, claim 6 is definite.

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurachi et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002-160943). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kurachi discloses the glass substrate that includes 55 – 72 mol % of  $\text{SiO}_2$  and teaches that it becomes difficult for the glass substrate to melt when the content of  $\text{SiO}_2$  is

Application Number 10/589548  
Response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2008

higher than 72 mol % (see paras. 42 and 44). In contrast, claim 1 requires that the SiO<sub>2</sub> content of the glass substrate be at least 74 mol %. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguished from the reference. In addition, Kurachi discloses that the glass substrate needs to include 5 – 20 mol % of Li<sub>2</sub>O in contrast to claim 10 that requires the glass substrate be substantially free from Li<sub>2</sub>O. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurachi et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002-160943) in view of Takei et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002-201040). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kurachi teaches that the SiO<sub>2</sub> content must not exceed 72 mol % as discussed above. However, claim 7 requires that the glass substrate contain minimum 74 mol % of SiO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, claim 7 is distinguished from Kurachi. Takei discloses the SiO<sub>2</sub> content in weight %, not in mol % as provided in claim 1, and accordingly, in claim 7. Therefore, the SiO<sub>2</sub> content in Takei 45 – 78 wt % (see para. 7 of Takei) cannot be directly corresponded to those of claim 1 and accordingly, of claim 7. Further, as Kurachi teaches that it becomes difficult for the glass substrate to melt when the content of SiO<sub>2</sub> is higher than 72 mol % as discussed above, this is no reasonable basis for those skilled in the art to consider the very upper end of the Takei range relevant to Kurachi. Accordingly, Takei does not remedy the deficiencies of Kurachi, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application Number 10/589548  
Response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2008

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.



Dated: May 16, 2008

DPM/my/ad

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300